

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

GUILLERMO TRUJILLO CRUZ,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
B. SMITH, *et al.*,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-00693-RFB-VCF  
  
ORDER

**I. DISCUSSION**

On April 16, 2018, Plaintiff, who is a prisoner in California, filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and submitted an affidavit with exhibits. (ECF No. 1, 1-1). Plaintiff did not file a complaint in this matter.

On April 19, 2018, the Court ordered Plaintiff to submit a complaint to the Court within thirty days and warned him that the failure to timely comply with that order might result in the dismissal of this case. (ECF No. 2 at 2). The thirty-day period expired and Plaintiff did not file a complaint. Because Plaintiff did not file a complaint in this matter, on May 31, 2018, the Court dismissed the case without prejudice and denied the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* as moot. (ECF No. 3).

On June 18, 2018, Plaintiff responded to the dismissal by filing a document he entitled "Notice of Action." (ECF No. 5). Plaintiff states that the defendant in the instant case was joined in case number 1:17-cv-00789-AWI-GSA-PC, and he asks the court to

1 correct the error. (*Id.* at 1.) The Court construes this document as a motion for  
2 reconsideration of its order dismissing the case.

3 A motion to reconsider must set forth “some valid reason why the court should  
4 reconsider its prior decision” and set “forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to  
5 persuade the court to reverse its prior decision.” *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F.Supp.2d  
6 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2003). Reconsideration is appropriate if this Court “(1) is presented  
7 with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was  
8 manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.” *Sch. Dist.*  
9 *No. 1J v. Acands, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993).

10 The Court finds that there are no grounds for reconsideration. When Plaintiff filed  
11 his application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, he indicated that he was filing a new case.  
12 (ECF No. 1 at 1.) Furthermore, the case number that Plaintiff references in his most  
13 recent filing is not a case in the District of Nevada. Accordingly, the Court denies the  
14 motion for reconsideration.

15 **II. CONCLUSION**

16 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration is  
17 denied.

18  
19 DATED this 25th day of June, 2018.

20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 RICHARD F. BOULARE, II  
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28